Current
Policy No. 427

Proposed Refugee Admissions for FY 1983

September 1982

United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following are statements by Kenneth W. Dam, Acting Secretary of State, and Ambassador H. Eugene Douglas, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on September 29, 1982. Also included is President Reagan's memorandum of October 11, 1982.

ACTING SECRETARY DAM

These annual consultations are held with the purpose of reaching agreement on the admission of refugees into the United States during the coming fiscal year. The world refugee problem remains serious, affecting the lives and health of many people in most parts of the globe. Approximately 7.5 million of the world's people in 1982 are refugees, and the great majority of these people have been in that unfortunate status for many years.

In Southeast Asia, there have been continuing, though diminished, refugee flows from the Communist-dominated states of Indochina.

In Europe, the imposition of martial law in Poland on December 13, 1981, served, in effect, to make refugees of many thousands of Poles residing temporarily in Austria and other countries of Western Europe.

Longstanding patterns of discrimination and persecution in the Soviet Union continue to cause Jews and other minorities to assert their human right of emigration, although restrictions imposed by the Soviet authorities caused sharp reductions in permitted emigration from that country in 1982.

Aggressive Soviet policies are also responsible for the continued massive exodus of Afghans fleeing the occupation of their homeland. More than 3 million Afghans have taken refuge abroad, over 2.7 million of them in Pakistan.

It is no accident of history that the countries from which most refugees flee continue to be those under Communist domination or leadership, for it is in those countries that the basic aspirations of life—which we sum up in the term human rights—are most persistently violated.

It is inescapable that the United States has a vital leadership role to play in this grave situation. But let me stress that this role does not necessarily require refugees to be admitted into the United States, except in cases involving particular foreign policy imperatives or in situations of special concern. The prudent management of refugee programs worldwide should make it possible to reduce significantly the numbers of refugees in need of third-country resettlement. This has been a major objective of our policies in the past year and an objective, I can report, shared by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and by the international community as a whole.

READEX FICHE best copy available

S 1.71/4:

The most desirable resolution of a refugee problem, of course, is for the refugees to be enabled to return—voluntarily and freely—to their homelands. Frequently this cannot take place in the near term, but with time the situation that caused refugees to flee may change sufficiently to permit voluntary repatriation.

The High Commissioner and we believe that refugee situations should be resolved, wherever possible, in the place or region where the refugees themselves have their roots. In many cases a neighboring country has links of geography, language, and ethnic character which ease the acceptance of refugees when they arrive and may facilitate their longer term integration. The world community and the refugees are thus spared the costs and difficulties of resettlement in distant countries and different cultures.

We acknowledge the major contribution of the countries providing refuge. These countries provide land, access to roads and infrastructure, and public health care and often even confer citizenship or other legal status upon refugees. They need and deserve the help of the concerned international community.

International Relief Efforts

In 1982 and again in 1983 and future years, a higher portion of the total U.S. funds allocated to refugee programs will go for care and maintenance of refugees in camps and other temporary settlements. Where feasible and acceptable to the host country, funds support more permanent facilities to ease the transition to durable solutions.

We cooperate with like-minded countries in sharing the financial and material costs of refugee assistance. Burdensharing is central to a successful international approach to refugee assistance. We look to the UNHCR to take the lead in defining and organizing assistance programs that respond to the needs of the refugees and of the host countries, to preserve the possibility of voluntary repatriation, and to look ahead to effective long-term solutions.

We also work closely with other international bodies—the World Food Program; the U.N. Children's Fund (UNICEF); the World Health Organization; the International Red Cross; and, for the Palestinians, the U.N. Relief and Works Administration (UNRWA). Through them, as well as directly, we provide support to a broad range of private humanitarian organizations.

Some of the major ongoing assistance programs that we help support include:

Thailand and Kampuchea. Since 1982, the World Food Program has taken the lead in meeting food emergency needs on the Thai-Kampuchean border and inside Kampuchea. Although the numbers of Khmer at the border remained substantial, the rate of new arrivals has slowed to a trickle.

Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan deserves high commendation for its key role in assuring basic life support for 2.7 million Afghan refugees inside its borders. The UNHCR is the lead agency for the international community, coordinating the programs of some 28 voluntary agencies.

Central America. The United States contributes one-third of the support for UNHCR and World Food Program operations which assist El Salvadorans and Nicaraguans who have taken refuge in Honduras and other countries of the area.

Africa. The largest share of our assistance programs for refugees is allocated to Africa. In Somalia, CARE and Save the Children are key operating arms for the UNHCR and cooperate closely with the Government of Somalia. The United States funds a number of special projects in such fields as education and health for African refugees and is a leading contributor to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) program which reaches refugees in areas of armed conflict and civil strife, such as Chad and Angola.

Our total refugee relief assistance programs will claim some $270 million in fiscal year (FY) 1982—in addition to Food for Peace (PL 480, Title II—$75 million in 1982)—and $238 million in FY 1983. The amounts provided to these programs are essential to enable the United States to carry its share of the costs of assisting refugees who have found asylum in various regions of the world. By enabling refugees to be cared for in areas near their home countries, these funds reduce the need to resettle refugees in distant places, including the United States.

International Resettlement Cooperation

Situations continue to exist, however, in which third-country resettlement is necessary and in which the United States and other nations will continue to be called on to admit refugees who cannot return to their homeland without fear of persecution. The United States will be asked to do its fair share, but the responsibility for accepting refugees for resettlement outside their regions is one which properly falls on the entire international community.

During the past year there have been continuing actions directed at maintaining a wide range of resettlement opportunities. The UNHCR has conducted special consultations on resettlement of refugees from Indochina, encouraging states that previously accepted Indochinese to maintain or restore their programs. Significant numbers of Indochinese continue to be accepted by Australia, Canada, and France. Some countries taking smaller numbers—Switzerland, for example—accept refugees needing long-term medical care and rehabilitation. Several governments contribute to a pool of numbers to facilitate the resettlement of refugees rescued at sea by foreign flag ships.

Resettlement has been internationally shared for non-Indochinese as well. The Federal Republic of Germany has granted refuge to large numbers of ethnic Germans from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, as well as Poles unable to return to their homeland. Australia and Canada continue their generous admissions programs for refugees from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Efforts continue to arrange resettlement for refugees in Latin American and other developing countries.

Third-country resettlement is not easy. Countries which in the past accepted larger numbers now find it necessary to restrict admission for economic reasons similar to those facing the United States. All the traditional refugee-receiving countries are facing increased domestic costs for refugee resettlement at a time of economic trouble.

Proposed Admissions Levels

The admissions levels we are proposing for FY 1983 represent our considered effort to balance our international obligations with the constraints of domestic impact. The numbers recommended for FY 1983 are as follows:

East Asia	68,000
Africa	3,000
Soviet Union and Eastern Europe	17,000
Latin America and the Caribbean	2,000
Near East and South Asia	8,000
TOTAL	98,000

These proposed numbers continue the downward trend for admissions in recent years. In FY 1981, some 158,000 refugees were admitted to the United States. This was 57,000 fewer than the 215,000 who arrived in FY 1980. Admissions in FY 1982 are expected to be 98,500, almost 60,000 fewer than in FY 1981 and some 42,000 below the admissions ceilings agreed to in the past year's consultations. Far from seeking to expand refugee admissions, we accept only refugees of special concern to the United States, who meet our admissions criteria, for whom there are no alternative solutions, and whose admission is required by compelling foreign policy considerations.

East Asia. There continue to be urgent foreign policy reasons for the proposed number of admissions from East Asia—68,000. The countries of the area offering temporary refuge remain under heavy domestic pressure to limit the numbers of refugees in their territory. Some of the Indochinese refugee groups also kindle historic ethnic and political tensions.

The countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) have been our partners in handling the Indochinese refugee problem. They share our interest in reducing the refugee influx and have cooperated with us toward this end. They now fear, however, that the efforts of resettlement countries are diminishing faster than the problem, thus leaving the ASEAN nations with a significant permanent refugee population. Thailand, in particular, has indicated that in such circumstances it might change its first-asylum policies.

Given the current downward trend in new arrivals in countries of East Asia, our proposed program—combined with those of other resettlement countries—should result in a continued reduction in the refugee population and thus help maintain first asylum. As in the past, we will make every effort to operate our Indochinese refugee resettlement program at prudent levels.

The Vietnamese military presence in Kampuchea and Laos is a constant military threat to the area. The United States has a special concern for the refugees from Indochina. We have supported programs to reduce the refugee flow, such as the food program for Kampucheans on the Thai-Kampuchean border and inside Kampuchea. We also support UNHCR-supported voluntary repatriation programs for Kampucheans and Laotians. We have acted to reduce any possible magnet effect of the U.S. program by limiting our admissions to refugees in first-asylum countries who have relatives in the United States or who have demonstrated past ties to the United States. Voice of America broadcasts make clear the reduced scope of the U.S. program. We believe our new narrower processing priorities enable us to select for admission those refugees for whom resettlement in the United States is truly the necessary option.

At the same time we have made clear our readiness to accept increased numbers of Indochinese through the Orderly Departure Program as refugees or, for those who qualify, as immigrants. (About one-quarter to one-third of those admitted in 1982 entered the United States not as refugees but with immigration visas.)

We would like to see the Orderly Departure Program expanded. It provides a means to process some eligible political prisoners from so-called "re-education camps"—many held since 1975 under grim conditions in what amount to concentration camps. Many of these persons were associated with former governments of Vietnam or with U.S. programs in the area.

We are also prepared to process Amerasians—the children of American fathers and Vietnamese mothers. Amerasians will be admitted either as refugees or under proposed legislation providing relief for such cases.

While we have reduced the numbers of refugees coming to the United States, we have expanded and improved our overseas programs to prepare refugees for self-sufficiency. About 88% of all working-age Indochinese refugees coming here now receive extended English-as-a-second-language training and cultural orientation in the refugee processing centers in the area—at less than one-half of the cost of such training in the United States. Some 17,000 refugees approved by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in FY 1982 are now in the centers and will be moved in FY 1983 as part of the FY 1983 admissions.

We are also strengthening our medical screening of refugees in Southeast Asia with improved followup measures, where needed, by local public health officials in the United States. It is clear that the costs of treating medical problems overseas are significantly lower than the costs of comparable treatment after refugees arrive in the United States.

Africa. The 3,000 refugees proposed to be admitted from Africa enable us to relieve pressures in specific areas and to assist refugees who cannot be cared for in the region. This would include certain skilled, urban refugees who cannot be assimilated in rural areas; former political prisoners needing the security of resettlement abroad; and other refugees requiring third-country resettlement for political or other reasons. Many of those expected to apply for admission to the United States are Ethiopians, with small numbers coming from southern Africa and other areas. We are responsive to the concern of African leaders that overseas resettlement programs not encourage a "brain drain" of persons whose skills are needed in Africa.

The President's admissions proposals for FY 1983 represent the essential minimum needed to support the far greater numbers of refugees being assisted overseas and take full account of the burdens borne by our states and communities at home.

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Our proposed ceiling for refugees from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is 17,000. These refugees have long been a special concern of the United States and have benefited from various admissions programs since the end of World War II.

The declaration of martial law in Poland on December 13, 1981, created a new situation for refugees from that country. Many Poles found themselves in Western Europe when the Polish authorities moved against the liberalizing tendencies represented by the Solidarity trade union movement. Uncertain of what awaited them if they returned to their country, many Poles obtained refuge in countries such as Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and the Scandinavian countries. Although most have chosen to remain in these countries, a substantial number—estimated at 18,000 for FY 1983—are expected to seek re-

settlement in third countries, about half of them in the United States. In addition, a small number of political detainees are being released by the Polish Government and permitted to travel to Western countries, including the United States.

Events in Poland overshadowed the situations in other Eastern European countries, but there continues to be a substantial refugee flow from them as well. Although predictions are uncertain, we project a total flow from Eastern Europe other than Poland of 10,000 in FY 1983, of whom half are likely to seek admission to the United States.

Our concern for refugees from the Soviet Union is also longstanding. In the past year, the Soviet authorities have further restricted the emigration of all groups. The number of Soviet Jews arriving in the West fell below 4,000 in FY 1982, and there are renewed reports of harsh treatment of Jews seeking permission to emigrate. Family reunification continues to be the only officially accepted reason for emigration from the Soviet Union; most of the small number of Jews permitted to leave do so on visas for Israel, even though many of those departing or seeking to leave want to settle elsewhere. There have also been sharp reductions in the numbers of Armenians departing the Soviet Union, and this group, too, is limited to cases of family reunion. Fewer than 400 Armenians reached the United States in FY 1982, and the numbers for these and other groups in FY 1983 are likely to continue at a low level, barring major changes in the overall state of U.S.-Soviet relations.

Latin America and the Caribbean. In Latin America substantial numbers of refugees and persons displaced by fighting and civil strife have received refuge in neighboring countries. We are recommending that a maximum of 2,000 refugees be admitted to the United States. We have played an active role in supporting UNHCR programs of care and maintenance in Latin America. Most of those affected by the strife do not, however, require resettlement outside Latin America, thanks to the longstanding tradition of granting asylum within the region. Our programs are designed to encourage and support that tradition, while relieving situations of special concern by admitting persons such as former and current political prisoners, immediate relatives of refugees already in the United States, and persons in especially compelling circumstances. One such group consists of former political prisoners from Cuba who have found temporary refuge in Spain and Costa Rica. Through a considered balance of assistance and limited admissions, our refugee programs can continue to contribute to the peace and stability of the area.

Near East and South Asia. The Near East and South Asia area is characterized by large refugee populations requiring assistance and relatively small numbers in need of resettlement. The proposed admission ceiling for the region is 8,000.

Over 3 million Afghans have left their country since the Soviet invasion of late 1979, the vast majority of whom are tribal people who look forward to the possibility of repatriation and, therefore, prefer to remain in Pakistan or Iran. In these circumstances, the primary response of the United States has been to support the international relief programs being implemented by the Government of Pakistan with the help of private voluntary agencies. The admission of a small number of urban Afghans to the United States is carried out on an individual basis and is limited to those with close family or other ties to the United States. This program helps to support the Pakistani policy of providing refuge for the tribal refugees.

Iranians constitute another group forced to live in exile from their homeland. Tens of thousands left Iran following the overthrow of the Shah and the rise to power of the Ayatollah Khomeini. Many have found refuge. A large number have been admitted to the United States on humanitarian parole or long-term nonimmigrant visa status. A limited number of Iranians who have a fear of persecution under the current regime in Iran are included under our Near Eastern and South Asian refugee admission ceiling during FY 1983. Those admitted under this program would have to (1) meet the definition of a refugee, (2) still be in a transient status, and (3) have close associations with or relatives in the United States.

We also expect to continue to admit small numbers of refugees from other countries in that region who have faced persecution or have a well-founded fear of persecution in their homelands. The United States will continue to provide major amounts of assistance for Palestinian refugees, and we are contributing major amounts for reconstruction efforts in Lebanon itself. We have earmarked $39.5 million for emergency relief in Lebanon and an additional $66 million for the long-term rehabilitation and reconstruction of that country.

Domestic Program

Our most important objective in the coming year is to strengthen and improve the domestic aspects of our refugee programs. The Departments of State and of Health and Human Services have developed a placement policy designed to achieve a more rational distribution of refugees in the United States. The policy results from consultations with private voluntary agencies, with state and local governments, and with concerned national organizations. Its adoption follows actions taken by the voluntary agencies themselves to limit the placement of refugees in areas of high impact: places where there are large concentrations of refugees and high public assistance costs.

This placement policy anticipates provisions of the Refugee Act Amendments by limiting the resettlement of new arrivals to areas outside the high impact zones. Exceptions continue to be made for close family reunification cases, but the policy would bar relatives on welfare from serving as sponsors. Although the high proportion of family reunion cases among new arrivals will moderate the impact of the policy, this will be offset by the expected lower rate of arrivals, which by itself will reduce the numbers going to the areas of highest concentration.

The Department of State has initiated a program of direct monitoring of performance by the voluntary agencies under its cooperative agreements. This program would involve on-site visits to American cities to review agency performance and gather information on the role of other programs, public and private, that assist the resettlement of refugees. The monitoring program has the objective of assuring full implementation of the services specified in the cooperative agreements and effective utilization of the reception and placement grants. We also have reviewed the accumulations of funds held by some agencies as a result of the reception and placement grants. The agencies have provided additional information on these funds and their plans for using them to assist refugees. Tightened procedures regarding the use of these funds will assure their timely expenditure for programs of direct benefit to refugees.

We continue to work closely with the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the Public Health Service to augment overseas screening and medical treatment programs. Our aim is to reduce the need for such care for

refugees after they arrive in the United States and to assure adequate followup screening and health services. Health assessments funded by CDC help prevent public health problems and identify personal health problems that interfere with self-sufficiency. In the past 2 years, about 85% of all arriving Indochinese refugees have received health assessments.

Conclusion

Our refugee programs form an essential part of our foreign policy and continue a generous and humane tradition in which all Americans can take pride and satisfaction. The President's admissions proposals for FY 1983 represent the essential minimum needed to support the far greater numbers of refugees being assisted overseas and take full account of the burdens borne by our states and communities at home. The proposed program is prudent and balanced, and we hope it will have your concurrence.

AMBASSADOR DOUGLAS

I am pleased to be here today to consult with you on the proposed refugee admissions numbers for FY 1983. Although the consultation process is required by the Refugee Act, it is, nonetheless, a process I seek because of the vital importance of congressional input to the success of the refugee program. The President has made an initial recommendation on refugee admissions numbers for FY 1983. The President's final decision, however, awaits our consultations here with you.

Before I describe to you our recommendations for refugee admissions numbers for FY 1983, I would like to briefly state where we think the American refugee program is going in the next several years. Since 1975, as we all know, this country has resettled an extraordinary number of refugees: almost 650,000 Indochinese refugees since 1975 and 160,000 Cuban-Haitian entrants since 1980. This great flow of refugees and entrants, particularly the Indochinese, set the stage for the Refugee Act, which sought to give direction and control to the program.

Our acceptance of this great number of refugees admirably reflects a traditional feeling among the American people that the United States is a haven for the oppressed. This tradition has committed us in the past to a generous refugee policy. Our most current experience, however, has brought with it a realization that things have changed since the last great waves of open immigration into this country.

In the first decades of the century, there was no welfare system to retard the initiative of the new arrivals to achieve early self-sufficiency; nor was there the industrial stagnation and lack of job opportunities that we have seen in recent years. These domestic developments coincide with an international climate in which freedom and regard for individual liberties is growing ever shorter in supply, and more and more people want to come to the United States. In addition, we are pressured not only by the increasing numbers of refugees but by ever-increasing illegal immigration into our country.

Given these circumstances, we must ask ourselves some hard questions and make choices among refugee groups, all of whose claims merit our compassion. We feel that the refugee admissions numbers we have recommended reflect careful and thoughtful planning. In making these choices we have been guided by the following principles:

- For purposes of resettlement we will give priority to refugees with close ties to the United States, such as past employment with the U.S. Government or to those who have relatives in this country;
- Overall refugee admissions numbers must be more closely related to the domestic resources available to resettle them;
- Resettlement in the United States is the solution of last resort for dealing with refugee crises and is to be used only in cases of special humanitarian need or when assistance in place or repatriation are not feasible; and
- Promoting stability in democratic countries of first asylum is an important objective of our refugee program.

Refugee Admissions

For resettlement in FY 1983, we are proposing that the United States admit a total of 98,000 refugees, composed of 68,000 from East Asia; 17,000 from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; 8,000 from the Near East and South Asia; 3,000 from Africa; and 2,000 from Latin America. In addition, we propose that up to 5,000 aliens granted asylum in the United States be permitted to adjust their status to become permanent resident aliens.

Southeast Asia. The greatest share of our refugee population will still come from Southeast Asia. The reasons are

---

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S MEMORANDUM, OCT. 11, 1982

Presidential
Determination No. 83-2

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE H. EUGENE DOUGLAS
United States Coordinator for
Refugee Affairs

SUBJECT: FY 1983 Refugee Ceilings

Pursuant to Sections 207(a) and 207.1(a)(3) and in accordance with Section 209(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), after appropriate consultations with the Congress, I hereby determine that:

- the admission of up to 90,000 refugees to the United States during FY 1983 is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest;
- the 90,000 refugee admission ceiling shall be allocated as 64,000 for East Asia; 15,000 for the Soviet Union/Eastern Europe; 6,000 for the Near East/South Asia; 3,000 for Africa; and 2,000 for Latin America/Caribbean; and
- an additional 5,000 refugee admission numbers to be available for the adjustment to permanent residence status of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

Pursuant to Section 101(a)(42)(B) of the INA and after appropriate consultations with the Congress, I hereby specify that special circumstances exist such that, for the purposes of admission under the limits established herein, the following persons, if they otherwise qualify for admission, may be considered refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States even though they are still within their countries of nationality or habitual residence:

- persons in Vietnam with past or present ties to the United States; and
- present and former political prisoners, and persons in imminent danger of loss of life, and their family members, in countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

You will inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of these determinations.

This memorandum shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

RONALD REAGAN

cc: The Honorable George P. Shultz
The Honorable William French Smith
The Honorable Richard S. Schweiker

twofold. In the first place, out of the current major refugee groups, Southeast Asian refugees have the strongest association with the United States through relatives here or previous employment. In the second place, they are unable to return home and must exist in increasingly untenable first-asylum situations.

There has been a substantial reduction in the first-asylum refugee populations in Southeast Asia over the recent past. In Thailand, for instance, the refugee population declined from a high of 307,000 in mid-1980 to about 180,000 in mid-1982. While the United States cannot be expected to take the remainder of these refugees, we do take seriously the commitment of the international community to insure that, over time, refugee populations in the first-asylum countries will be reduced. The United States has not and will not withdraw from this joint undertaking. I believe the consultation request for FY 1983 Indochinese refugees reflects the seriousness of our firm commitment to help resolve this difficult problem. The Southeast Asian countries of first asylum deserve our reassurance that they will not be faced with a large residual population of Indochinese refugees.

This Administration is aware that, in the past, refugee ceilings easily became self-fulfilling targets. In our view, the national refugee program requires careful management to insure that the international pressures are balanced by available domestic capabilities. We have planned the FY 1983 Indochinese refugee admissions as carefully and knowledgeably as possible. There are, however, several somewhat difficult-to-predict situations that we must take into consideration.

First, we are assuming that the flow of Indochinese refugees out of the area will continue to decline. We believe that recent policies have helped temper the flow. While first-asylum refuge remains for those who must flee, the decreased expectation of resettlement in the United States and other countries does not provide the same strong attraction as before.

Second, the Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam, which we hope will be seen as an increasingly viable alternative to flight by sea, may grow somewhat faster than we had earlier expected.

Third, in an effort to promote the maximum number of voluntary repatriations from among Kampuchean refugees in Thailand, their resettlement was deferred earlier in the fiscal year to permit the UNHCR to attempt an agreement with Phnom Penh on voluntary repatriation. Unfortunately, this effort was unsuccessful. While maximizing voluntary repatriation remains the first priority of the UNHCR, we have to bear in mind that the situation of the Kampuchean refugees in Thailand is particularly fragile.

Fourth, there is the prospect of responding to a problem with which I believe most Americans have particular sympathy: the Amerasian children who face discrimination in Indochina. We would like to help as many of these children as possible who can provide documentation regarding their citizenship or relationship to American citizen fathers. In the absence of legislation which would allow Amerasian children direct entry into the United States as immigrants, the State Department will begin processing eligible children under the Orderly Departure Program. It is important to understand, however, that while the U.S. Government is willing to consider these children for entry, the Government of Vietnam must also allow them to exit. There is no firm assurance yet from Vietnamese officials that the children will be allowed to leave Vietnam.

Finally, you are aware of speculation about the possible release of Vietnamese prisoners in "re-education camps." It is likely that many of these prisoners would be eligible to enter the United States under our refugee criteria. I believe it is prudent to have some refugee numbers available for a group whose close association with the United States has caused them to suffer special persecution.

Eastern Europe. With regard to Eastern Europe, particularly Poland and the Soviet Union, we propose to admit up to 6,000 Soviet refugees and 11,000 from Poland and several other countries including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania. In Poland, the military declaration of martial law in December 1981 occurred at a time when approximately 200,000 Poles were in Western Europe. Many were able to remain there in indefinite status, while thousands of others sought permanent asylum elsewhere. These movements have placed considerable pressures on countries of first asylum.

During the past year, the Administration has taken a hard look at the Romanian third-country processing operation and concluded that several changes were in order. First, the Department of State will attempt to improve INS processing access to Romanian applicants and to improve the medical screening of all applicants. The second improvement objective is to endeavor to process as many Romanian applicants as qualify for immigration status rather than refugee status. The Romanian third-country processing program should be used only for the most deserving refugee cases. And finally, we would like to see improvements in the Romanian Government's treatment of its citizens who make known their desire to emigrate from Romania.

In the past year, the emigration of Soviet Jews has reached its most critical point since 1970. Last year the Soviet Union allowed the smallest number of Jews in a decade to leave. At the same time, increased harassment, oppression, and anti-Semitism have been imposed upon the lives of over 2 million Jews still living in Russia. About 200 a month were given visas and, of those, 150 a month came to the United States. We deplore this low level of Soviet emigration and hope that our continued commitment to offer resettlement to refugees from the Soviet Union will serve as a strong signal of our condemnation of persecution, the low level of emigration, and a signal of hope for those who remain behind.

Near East and South Asia. In the Near East and South Asia, nearly 3 million people have fled Soviet aggression and atrocities in Afghanistan. These refugees have been well received by the Government of Pakistan. Despite its own struggles with economic development, Pakistan has committed its limited resources to help support the refugees now living within its borders. Because of Pakistan's generosity and the support of the international community, we anticipate entry into the United States of only a small number of Afghan refugees who qualify under family reunification or prior association with the United States.

The President has proposed for FY 1983 the inclusion of Iranian refugees for admission to the United States under the ceiling for refugees from the Near East and South Asia. This inclusion of Iranians under the Refugee Act replaces the practice of the past several years of admitting them through the Attorney General's parole authority.

Palestinian refugees in the Near East are being assisted by the U.N. Rehabilitation and Works Agency (UNRWA). It is our policy to support UNRWA and the other relief organizations helping the Palestinians and assisting in the rehabilitation of Lebanon, but with individual exceptions

we would not expect to admit such persons to the United States.

Africa. In the area of Africa, although the number of refugees is large, the nations there have established some of the most progressive and open refugee policies anywhere in the world. Although serious refugee situations persist in Chad, Djibouti, Sudan, Cameroon, and in southern Africa, most of the refugees are being cared for in neighboring countries. There are, however, a few cases where the refugees are under threat in countries of asylum or have close relatives in the United States—such as Ethiopians. For these cases, the United States anticipates admitting a small number of refugees, not to exceed 3,000.

Latin America. The nations of Latin America also have a generous refugee policy. Most of those fleeing political turmoil in the hemisphere are sheltered in neighboring countries. Because of this only a few of those will need to be settled here.

We estimate a $175 million cost to the Federal Government for processing, transporting, training overseas, and initially placing the refugees we propose to admit in FY 1983. In addition, we estimate that the cost of cash, medical, and other Federal assistance to these refugees who will be admitted in FY 1983 will be about $225 million. The projected total cost of all U.S. refugee assistance in FY 1983 will be approximately $1.7 billion, which includes over $300 million in assistance for millions of refugees and displaced persons overseas who may never come to the United States, as well as $900 million for assistance to refugees in the United States who entered this country in prior years. In consultation with my office, the Department of Health and Human Services administers the bulk of domestic assistance to refugees with the Department of State concentrating on overseas programs and the processing, initial reception, and placement of refugees in the United States.

Early in 1983, the UNHCR must also begin to think about consolidation of refugee camps in Southeast Asia. As refugee flows out of Southeast Asian countries continue to diminish, I believe we should phase out and close refugee camps as they become less and less cost efficient or as training programs can be consolidated in fewer camps. These consolidations may require some expansion of the refugee processing center facilities at Bataan. The Philippine Government has agreed in principle to the expansion of this facility if it is necessary. We will determine during the next 4 to 6 months whether an expansion of the refugee processing center is necessary or practical.

Promoting Refugee Self-sufficiency

The cost of the refugee program brings me to an area which has taken on increasing importance in the last 2 years and which is a chief priority of mine—the problems of our domestic refugee resettlement program and, in particular, the continuing high refugee dependency rates. While one can argue over the best method of calculating a dependency rate, the factual result remains the same: public assistance for refugees remains the largest cost of the domestic refugee resettlement program. I do not question the need to provide assistance to refugees who honestly require assistance or who are eligible for these programs. I am seriously concerned, however, about the apparent misuse or overutilization of our refugee public assistance programs. Many refugees appear to regard public assistance as an entitlement. Voluntary resettlement agencies and local welfare officials often do little to discourage this attitude. Refugee public assistance is not an entitlement, nor do I believe it was the intent of Congress to establish an entitlement program.

My observation of our domestic resettlement program over the last 6 months inclines me to believe that we have lost the distinction between refugees and other dependent groups in this country that has been evident in virtually all refugee movements to the United States since World War II. The reality of that distinction was that refugees should not be viewed as long-term dependent populations.

The tools needed to adapt to a new society include employment services, practical problem-solving orientation and adjustment services, temporary maintenance while preparing for employment, English-language training integrated with employment, and health services. While there are mainstream programs for others in our society who need some of the same tools, it is arguable that those programs are not typically equipped to handle the distinctions posed by a refugee population. Therefore, while some ongoing programs can be tapped and "sensitized," new approaches are necessary in other human service fields.

I have heard many comments from people who cope with refugee resettlement at the community level. I have been told many times that they want a resettlement program, not a welfare program. It is clear to me that despite our efforts to the contrary we have a welfare program. There is no more urgent task in the coming year than making significant and visible progress in reducing the prolonged use of cash and medical assistance among refugees.

While I recognize that we cannot totally remove refugee resettlement efforts from traditional public assistance programs, I want to assure this committee that one of my major priorities for FY 1983 will be a serious effort—in concert with Congress, government agencies, states, and the private voluntary sector—to redefine, develop, and implement a domestic refugee resettlement program that is innovative, efficient, sustainable, and which provides realistic and more effective incentives to self-sufficiency than are now available.

Americans have been traditionally sympathetic to refugees. We are moved by what has happened to the Kampucheans since 1975 or to the Vietnamese who make a perilous voyage across the South China Sea. But we must once again understand the promise of refugees as much as we respond to their trauma. And so must the refugees themselves. Both parties should begin to adjust their expectations accordingly, but it is our special responsibility to give the refugees who come to this country the self-respect that comes from knowing that, in spite of and because of what they have been through, the American people expect them to succeed here. Consequently, self-sufficiency should be the fundamental goal of all refugee resettlement programs in the United States.

During FY 1983, we will engage in a thorough review of our refugee programs in an attempt to eliminate many of the serious problems facing the program. We have already begun some specific program changes and will review other modifications during 1983. We are undertaking a series of initiatives that will enhance our efforts to assist refugees in more quickly achieving self-sufficiency. I intend to focus on efforts on improving the health and skills of those refugees we will accept before they arrive in the United States. For certain groups, we are expanding the English-language training and cultural orientation program overseas from 14 to 24 weeks and propose to bring back to the camps as instructors refugees already resettled in the United States. I believe that successfully resettled refugees, who have gone through the painful experience of resettlement, will have an important impact on those refugees yet to come.

55 - copy cover

In the area of health care, the Japanese Government has agreed in principle to donate substantially increased resources to design, equip, and staff new clinical and laboratory facilities in the Bataan refugee processing center. They have similarly agreed to build and equip a dental clinic. These activities will substantially improve the physical health of refugees before they arrive and will reduce our domestic health costs.

The Japanese have also agreed to provide equipment and personnel for a vocational training program in the refugee processing center. This program will be developed in coordination with the states, industry, and labor to insure refugees are better prepared for work that is actually available in areas where they settle. These efforts will enhance and improve the crucial linkages between our overseas and domestic programs. If we can more effectively prepare refugees for the demands of resettlement in the United States through health programs, vocational training, and language and cultural orientation programs that are conducted overseas, we will be better able to enhance prospects for refugee self-sufficiency at less cost than has been the case in the past.

We see a much greater role for refugee mutual assistance associations here in the United States—to help other refugees help themselves, including those who have been here for some time but have not successfully integrated. As an example, we want to see more efforts like the Khmer Cluster Project in which the associations played key roles. Welfare dependency and secondary migration—two of our biggest problems—were significantly reduced among the Khmer who resettled under this program. Success was also due to preselecting resettlement sites and by advance consultation with state and local governments who received those refugees.

Dr. Hawkes, the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement at the Department of Health and Human Services, and members of my staff have recently visited Canada to review their refugee program. We are hopeful that some aspects of the Canadian resettlement experience may be applicable to improving our performance in the United States.

We intend to review the relationship between medical assistance and cash assistance and how the impact of these two programs on refugee resettlement might be improved. I will review the financial and program relationships of the voluntary and public sectors, the role of state governments, and review again the reception and placement grants to see if we can more effectively utilize this resource.

Self-sufficiency should be the principal goal of all refugee resettlement programs in the United States. It is not only a government effort but a cooperative venture deeply involving the voluntary resettlement agencies of this country. Our refugee programs have historically been an effort of the community and its representatives of the voluntary resettlement agencies. Their past efforts and accomplishments should be recognized by this committee. They should, as well, recognize our fervent desire to see them direct a greater portion of their energies to assist those refugees who have already been brought here—often languishing in despair and confusion—while at the same time developing a process that will increase the success of incoming refugees to adjust and to reach early self-sufficiency.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1982 - 381-412 - 488/459

Summary

In summary, let me say that I believe the international refugee problem is one that will be with us for some time—certainly for the remainder of this century. The refugees who are waiting in camps throughout the world for a just resolution of their plight are the direct and human result of man's inability to resolve his political conflicts. This Administration, consistent with those before it, maintains that refugees are the responsibility of not one or a few nations but of the entire world community. We are prepared to contribute our fair share and to accept into this country our fair quota of those needing resettlement. We do not expect to bear the refugee burden alone. In this regard, the Administration continues to effect its international refugee program through international organizations, primarily UNHCR, UNRWA, Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, UNICEF, and the ICRC. Together with like-minded governments we work for the protection of and assistance to refugees worldwide.

We believe, furthermore, that a strong human rights policy and pressure to end the injustices that create refugees must be major parts of any Administration's foreign policy. Ultimately, the fundamental solution to the world's refugee problem is not resettlement but the reversal of the current political climate in the world today where the number of countries affording their citizens basic human rights and dignity continues to shrink. ■

Published by the United States Department of State · Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Public Communication · Editorial Division · Washington, D.C. · November 1982
Editor: Colleen Sussman · This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

Bureau of Public Affairs
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Official Business

If address is incorrect
please indicate change.
Do not cover or destroy
this address label.

Postage and Fees Paid
Department of State
STA-501

Third Class Bulk Rate

U.S. MAIL